



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/224,696	01/04/1999	CASSONDRA L. CROTTY	BU9.97.226	3386

7590

03/15/2002

KEVIN R. CASEY  
RATNER & PRESTIA  
ONE WESTLAKES BERWYN P O BOX 980  
SUITE 301  
VALLEY FORGE, PA 194820980

EXAMINER

HARRISON, CHANTE E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SM

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/224,696

Applicant(s)  
Crotty et al.

Examiner  
Chante' Harrison

Group Art Unit  
2672



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Chante' Harrison

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Andrew Naye

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 13, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

\_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1-16

Identification of prior art discussed:

Schwuttke et al., U.S. Patent 6,222,547

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Representative acknowledged four issues which are thought to have been either inadequately addressed or not addressed by the Examiner. The first issue questioned the difference in purpose and function of the Applicant's invention and the prior art. Examiner asserts that the purpose and function of the invention and Schwuttke are different. However, this is irrelevant because the preamble claims the visualization of data, which is disclosed by the prior art. The remaining issues were in regards to Applicant's claimed generation of a grid based on when data values are entered. Representative acknowledged that the prior response identifying Schwuttke as disclosing the same because he forms a grid as a result of object classification was inadequate. Examiner maintained that Schwuttke forms a grid based on categorized data that is graphically represented by upon entering.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

MATTHEW LUU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.